

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-28 and 37-51 are pending in the above-identified patent application.

Claims 27 and 28 were allowed.

Claims 1-3, 16-23, 37-40, and 42-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious from Ding et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,058,880* (hereinafter "Ding") in view of Walker et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,845,472 (hereinafter "Walker").

Claims 4-15, 24-26, and 41 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim**, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Reconsideration of this application in light of the following remarks is hereby respectfully requested.

Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of claims 27-28, and the indication of allowability of claims 4-15, 24-26, and 41. Applicants expressly reserve the right to rewrite claims 4-15 and 41 in independent form should their base claims ultimately not be allowed. Applicants submit

* The Ding et al. reference was incorrectly identified as U.S. Patent No. 7,058,800 on page 2 of the Office Action. Applicants believe that the Office Action sought to refer to Ding et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,058,880 and have prepared this Reply to Office Action based on this assumption.

** Applicants submit that claim 24 is an independent claim which was erroneously indicated by the Examiner as being dependent on a rejected base claim (Office Action, page 11). At least for the reason that the Examiner indicated that claim 24 contains allowable subject matter (Office Action, page 11), applicants submit that claim 24, as well as claims 25-26 which depend therefrom, are allowable.

that claim 24, as well as claims 25 and 26 which depend therefrom, are allowable in their current form at least because claim 24 is independent and contains allowable subject matter.

Claims 1-28 and 37-51 were pending in the present application. In this Reply, applicants make clarifying amendments to claims 37, 45, and 49. Accordingly, claims 1-28 and 37-51 continue to be pending in the application.

Applicants submit that claims 1-28 and 37-51 are allowable, as discussed below.

The § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-3, 16-23, 37-40, and 42-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious from Ding in view of Walker. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' independent claims 1 and 20 and amended independent claims 37, 45, and 49 are directed towards circuits and methods for correcting errors in configuration data stored on a programmable logic device. Configuration data and error check data associated with the configuration data are stored on the programmable logic device. The configuration data is retrieved and analyzed to determine if any values have changed after initial configuration of the memory and to correct any values that have changed.

The Examiner contends that Ding discloses "a system with a programmable logic circuit with a memory for storing data which can be extracted for verification" (Office Action, p. 2). The Examiner admits, however, that Ding "does not disclose a system wherein configuration data is stored in the memory" (Office Action, p. 2), and relies on Walker to make up for the deficiencies in Ding.

Walker describes a system and technique for detecting data errors in a memory device. The system of Walker uses a redundant (4+1) error-detection and correction scheme "in which a parity word is created [...] such that any one of the four data words can be re-created using the parity word if an error is detected in one of the data words" (col. 4, ll. 47-56). The memory sub-system of Walker includes five memory cartridges 42a-e, memory cartridge 42e being used for parity storage (col. 5, l. 66 through col. 6, l. 11).

Applicants submit that Walker does not make up for the deficiencies in Ding at least because Walker fails to show or suggest a system in which a memory stores both configuration data and error check data associated with the configuration data, as required by applicants' claims. Indeed, Walker teaches a system in which various bits of a data word are stored on different memory devices mounted on different DIMMs (Dual Inline Memory Modules) of different memory cartridges 42a-d of a memory sub-system, and in which the parity error-checking bits of the data word are themselves stored on a different memory cartridge 42e than the data bits. If anything, Walker teaches storing error-check data on a separate memory than the memory storing the data. For at least the reason that applicants' independent claims 1, 20, 37, 45, and 49 require that the configuration data and the error-check data be stored on the programmable logic device, applicants submit that the claims are novel and non-obvious from Ding, Walker, or any combination thereof.

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 20, 37, 45, and 49, as well as claims 2, 3, 16-19, 21-23, 38-40, 42-44, 46-48, 50, and 51 which depend therefrom, are allowable.

Application No. 10/766,464
Amendment dated March 5, 2007
Reply to Office Action of September 6, 2006

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-3, 16-23, 37-40, and ~~42-51~~ be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that this application, including claims 1-28 and 37-51, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

An early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert R. Jackson
Reg. No. 26,183
Attorney for Applicants
FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 36981
1211 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8704
Tel.: (212) 596-9000
Fax: (212) 596-9090